

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D U 6 AUG 2005

PCT PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

1/9

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/IB2005/000312

International filing date (day/month/year)  
09.02.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)  
10.02.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G06F17/60

Applicant  
COMMONSENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS INC

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Neppel, C

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7372



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

10/588867  
International application No.  
PCT/IB2005/000312

AP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 10 AUG 2006

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ in written format
    - ☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2005/000312

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N) —	Yes: Claims	1-8
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-8
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-8
	No: Claims	

**2. Citations and explanations**

**see separate sheet**

**TEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**AP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 10 AUG 2006**

Re Item V.

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 : "What is a COM Add-In?" MICROSOFT OFFICE XP DEVELOPER,  
[Online] 2001, - 2001 XP002337101 Retrieved from the Internet:  
URL:<http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/default.asp?url=/library/en-us/modcore/html/developWhatIsCOMAddin.asp>; [retrieved on 2005-07-18]  
D2 : "ADD-INS, TEMPLATES, WIZARDS, AND LIBRARIES" MICROSOFT OFFICE  
XP DEVELOPER, [Online] 2001, - 1001 XP002337102 Retrieved from the  
Internet: URL:<http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/default.asp?url=/library/en-us/modcore/html/developAddinTemplatesWizardsLibraries.asp>; [retrieved on 2005-07-18]

- 2 The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claims 1-8 are not clear.

The terms "COMM Addin", "Microsoft", "Outlook" employed in said claims, the latter being registered trade marks, have no precise meaning as they are not internationally accepted as standard descriptive terms, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-matter of these claims unclear, Article 6 PCT.

- 3 Furthermore, the above-mentioned lack of clarity notwithstanding, the subject-matter of said claims does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT, and therefore the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT are not met.

- 3.1 The claims relate to extending the functionality of a personal organizational desktop application, particularly MS Outlook. Therefore, the toolbar of the application is changed by adding new buttons that are operable by the user to reply, forward mail items etc.

3.2 All aspects which relate to the extended functionality per se, i.e. the concept of having the possibility to reply, forward or copy mails, notes, tasks etc., is considered to pertain to the field of modelling or mental acts, and hence to the non-technological part of the application.

3.3 The technical part of the claims relates to the technical implementation of the new functionality concept on a computer system.

The technical person responsible for this task, i.e. the person skilled in the art, is the programmer or the implementation expert, typically provided with the complete description of the intended new functionality, in the form of a requirements specification given to him.

3.4 The technical solution disclosed in the claims for implementing said functionality lacks however an inventive step for the following reasons:

Using Add-ins to extend the functionality of a desktop application, such as MS Outlook, was general knowledge at the priority date of the application; see e.g. documents D1 or D2.

An inventive step can only be acknowledged if it can be established that the claimed subject matter provides a non-obvious solution to a technical problem over the prior art.

In the present case the examiner cannot identify what technical problem the subject matter of the claims is intended to solve.

4. Having regard to the state of the art at the relevant priority date, it is not evident that any aspect of the present application could be considered to involve technical considerations sufficient to provide a basis for acknowledging an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) EPC.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000312